

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states:

“The applicant arguments solely rely on ENG (US 2007/0140298) in view of Wolf et al (US 6,914,637). Applicant does not even address the limitations meet by Shay (US 2004/0114607). In response to Applicant’s arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.”

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that if all references cited by the Examiner are indeed appropriate, then all references should be addressed. However, in this particular situation, the Applicants believe that (1) the Examiner mis-apprehends the reference Wolf with regard to the invention and (2) Wolf is an inappropriate reference. The reason for the Applicant’s belief is described below.

The invention is specifically drawn to a packet based multimedia system. The Examiner states in the Final Office Action at page 4,

“For claim 1, 7, 13, Wolf discloses where the destination device is a display device (see Figure 2, reference 26). Additionally, **Wolf teaches a packet based multimedia system**... also note in column 2 **Wolf in his definition of a DVI link** expressively list the TDMS and DDC channel separately.” Emphasis added.

The Applicants have emphasized the statement by the Examiner that Wolf teaches a packet based multimedia system because this statement is incorrect. The system described by Wolf is defined to be a DVI system **which is not packet based**. For example, referring to the discussion of DVI at Wikipedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dvi>):

The data format used by DVI is based on the PanelLink serial format that uses This uses Transition Minimized Differential Signal (TMDS). A single DVI link consists of four twisted pairs of wire (red, green, blue, and clock) to transmit 24 bits per pixel. The timing of the signal almost exactly matches that of an analog video signal. The picture is transmitted line by line with blanking intervals between each line and each frame, and without packetization. No compression is used and there is no support for only transmitting changed parts of the image. This means that the whole frame is constantly re-transmitted. (emphasis added).

Since Wolf is NOT packet based, the Examiner's entire analysis is based upon a faulty premise. Therefore, the Applicant believes that there is no need to distinguish Shay.

The Applicants believe that claims 1, 7, and 13 and all claims depending thereon are neither suggested nor rendered obvious by any of the cited references taken separately or in any combination thereof.

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
(408) 255-8001